

REMARKS

The following amendment and remarks responds to the non-final Official Action mailed December 5, 2007 alleging that Applicant's amendment dated September 12, 2007 is non-responsive in that the proposed amended claims amount to cancelling of all claims drawn to an elected invention and presenting claims drawn to a non-elected invention. This amendment thus replaces the amendment dated September 12, 2007.

As an initial matter, Applicant does not agree that its September 12, 2007 amendment presented claims drawn to a "non-elected" invention or claims representing a shift in invention. Applicant's attorney had conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner on August 23, 2007 wherein the proposal of adding the language of "GUI screens" was discussed. Although the Examiner indicated that the term "scenes" used in the claims was a broad term that would apply to movie and clip editing functions such as disclosed in Kingler, Applicant explained that the present application had actually used the word "scenes" to mean "GUI screens," as indicated in the application at page 3:

It should [be] noted that a GUI screen for implementing a function to achieve a certain objective by prescription of described information as referred to as a "scene."

Thus, in order to clarify the claims in accordance with the specification, Applicant had amended the claims to specify that the claimed invention allows for the editor to create final GUI screens from shared screens, each of the shared screens comprising one or more shared user selectable objects that are controllable for display to create the final screens.

However, because of the Examiner's current position, Applicant proposes to resolve this matter by presenting differently worded amendments to the claims in order to

distinguish over Klingler, as Klingler does not disclose or teach:

a shared-scene creation module operable allow the editor to define shared scenes that are superimposable to create a single, superimposed and nonsequential final scene, the shared scenes being virtual scenes formed in accordance with an internal format and used to form the final scenes, each of the shared scenes comprising one or more shared objects that are controllable for display to create final scenes, the shared objects being separately controllable independent of the defined shared scenes in which the shared objects are displayed in accordance with the predetermined specification; [or]

a shared-scene processing module operable to enable the editor to virtually superimpose two or more shared scenes, each of the shared scenes comprising one or more of the shared objects, for creating the superimposed and nonsequential final scenes with the shared objects from each selected shared scene;

In other words, Klingler differs from the claimed invention in that it presents to the editor movie clips to be strung together *sequentially in time* with different possible effects (deemed by the Examiner to be "objects") to be applied across one or multiple sequential movie clips. What Klingler does not disclose or teach is to allow the editor, for example, to take clip A with an added effect 1, and clip B with added effects 2 and 3, and superimpose both clips to form a superimposed new clip (clip A overlaid upon clip B) with all of added effects 1-3 now being displayed.

By contrast, in accordance with the present invention, the editor is provided with shared scenes that include shared objects (such as the object "obl" in Fig. 16A) that are normally controlled independently to be displayed in a final scene, without regard to a shared scene. In the past, the more difficult way an editor would create a final scene, such as MHEG scene 2 of Fig. 16D, would be to decide when to turn each

individual object on or off for display in given final scene. However, as described, for example, in paragraphs [0267]-[0268] of the present application, the editor would need to have sufficient knowledge of the object scripting language to enable editing work done using only shared objects, on an object-by-object basis. Such prior editing tools only had the functionality of turning a shared object on or off simultaneously for all scenes, which made it difficult for the editor to utilize a *shared object* effectively among the various scenes. With the present invention, the editor can carry out editing work using *shared scenes* that are *superimposable* to create a single, superimposed and nonsequential final scene, as opposed to working with the objects alone. These final superimposed and nonsequential scenes simultaneously display all of the shared objects in each of the combined shared scene. As a result of the selection of shared scenes, the editor can create a single, superimposed final scene with the objects that he or she wants displayed without worrying about scripting needed to selectively turn shared objects on or off.

In view of the amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the presently presented claims patentably distinguish over Klingler and the rejection of the claims under § 102(b) based on Klingler should be withdrawn.


As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone Applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: December 26, 2007

Respectfully submitted

By   
Jonathan A. David  
Registration No.: 36,494  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRAMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

832992\_1.DOC